REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the present application. Original claim 6 was previously canceled. As amended herein, claims 1-5 are canceled and new claims 7-15 are added. New claims 7-15 generally correspond to previous claims 1-5 but have been rewritten for greater clarity, to correct minor typographical errors, and to address the Examiner's rejections discussed below. It is believed no new matter is introduced by these amendments.

Independent claims 7 and 13 generally correspond to original claims 1 and 5, respectively, but have also been amended to state that each slave device has a unique network address and that the data messages contain a destination address corresponding to the network address of the slave device the message is intended for. Support for this amendment can be found on page 5, lines 19-26, of the specification. Claims 7 and 13 also state that the one or more slave host computers are able to archive and log measurement data and alarm messages. Support for this amendment can be found on page 3, lines 2-19, and page 7, lines 1-5. New claim 8 recites that the measurements taken by the master host computers and slave host computers include pressure information and flow volume information of gas or oil wells. New claim 9 recites that control of RTU's includes the opening and closing of valves in gas or oil wells. Support for these amendments can be found on page 4, lines 27-31, of the specification.

Claim 15 recites allowing one or more slave host computers to be installed in a mobile vehicle to allow an operator to access trending measurement data, event log of alarm messages and provide control of one or more RTU's from remote locations. Support for this amendment can be found on page 2, lines 9-11, and lines 18-22, of the specification.

Objections to the Drawings and Specification

In the Office Action mailed July 3, 2007, the Examiner objected to Figure 1 because it was not labeled "Prior Art". Replacement Figure 1, as provided in the accompanying Replacement Drawings, is amended to include the label "Prior Art" as required by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Additionally, the drawings are renumbered as Figures 1-3, 4a and 4b in the Replacement Drawings, and the headings for Figures 4a and 4b (previously Figures 4 and 5) are switched. The heading "Host Telemetry Driver Flow Chart" is now correctly associated with Figure 4b (previously Figure 5), and the heading "Remote Terminal Unit Telemetry Driver Flow Chart" is now correctly associated with Figure 4a (previously Figure 4). The accompanying replacement sheets of the drawings replace Figures 1-5 as originally filed on May 27, 2005, and do not add new matter.

The Examiner also objected to the specification. Page 2, line 2, of the specification appears to be missing text as evidenced by the phrase "None of these references teach or suggest ***". The specification is hereby amended to delete this phrase from the specification. It is believed that the Background section of the specification is complete as amended. Additionally, the Examiner pointed out that there were five figures but that the detailed description only referred to four figures. The specification is hereby amended so that the Brief Description of the Drawings refers to all of the figures (as renumbered in the Replacement Drawings) and that line 22 on page 5 correctly refers to Figures 4a and 4b. The paragraph beginning at page 5, line 19, is also amended to correct minor typographical errors to improve clarity. In light of these corrections, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, in claim 1 the Examiner stated that it was unclear how a

cellular modem can be used for connectivity outside of the radio communication network when it is part of the network. Claim 1 is hereby canceled and language referring to the modem as being "outside" of the network is removed from the claims. New claim 7, which corresponds to claim 1, states that the cellular modem connects the slave host computers with the communication network but does not describe the modem as being "outside" of the network.

In claim 4, the Examiner stated that it was not clear how a slave host computer can itself include a computer system. Accordingly, this language has been removed from the claims.

In claim 5, the Examiner stated that it is not clear whether the steps of repeating and transmitting performed by the master host computer are the same steps. Claim 5 is canceled and new claim 13, which corresponds to claim 5, does not contain the "repeating" language.

New claims 7-14 are similar to previous claims 1-5 but have been rewritten for greater clarity and to correct minor typographical errors. It is believed the claims as provided with this Response address the Examiner's rejections under 35 USC 112. Therefore, Applicant requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner also rejected the claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Fierro et al. (6,747,571). Fierro discloses a master host computer connected to a number of slave devices as part of a wireless network. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine or adapt the references; a reasonable expectation of success; and the final combination must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. See MPEP 2142. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d

488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) because Fierro does not disclose all of the claim limitations recited in the amended claims.

As recited in independent claims 7 and 13, each RTU or slave device has a unique address on the data radio communication network. The wireless data messages transmitted by the master host computer contain a destination address which corresponds to the unique network address of the RTU or slave device the data message is intended for. The data messages are transmitted to multiple RTU's or slave devices, where each RTU or slave device determines if the destination address of the received message matches the unique network address. Fierro does not teach or suggest such a feature. Accordingly, each element of the amended claims is not taught or suggested by the cited reference and this rejection under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this case is in condition for allowance, and passage to issuance is respectfully requested. If there are further issues related to patentability, the courtesy of a telephone interview is requested, and the Examiner is invited to call to arrange a mutually convenient time.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Curtis
Reg. No. 54,053

GREENLEE, WINNER AND SULLIVAN, P.C.
4875 Pearl East Circle, Suite 200
Boulder, CO 80301
Telephone (303) 499-8080
Facsimile: (303) 499-8089
Email: winner@greenwin.com
Attorney Docket No.: 82-07
bmk: November 5, 2007